

## PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 22 August 65 22/2345Z	2. LOCATION Lancaster, California
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION A/C
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS Two	Evaluation as a/c and chase or escort plane most likely cause. Data presented consistent with this analysis.
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 3 Minutes, 1 Minute	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	Two objects. Large object round, small like a fly wing. Large object was white changing to a flashing white, small was brownish grey in color. Small object flying alongside larger object when first observed. Made crossover from left to right side. Very rapid crossover. No details or features noted on either object. Crossover was 2 seconds. Both moving at same speed. Small object disappeared rapidly and larger object continued flashing. Elevation 45 degrees azimuth 175 degrees. Flight to disappearance at 90 deg azimuth for the small object and 45 deg azimuth for the larger object was at 45 deg elevation. Flight was straight and even with the exception of the maneuver. Large object visible for 3 minutes, small for one. Objects disappeared in the desert haze. Flight was to the NE.
7. COURSE NE	
8. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	





HEADQUARTERS  
AIR FORCE FLIGHT TEST CENTER  
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE  
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA 93523



REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: FTF

SUBJECT: UFO

15 Sep 65

TO FTD (TDFC)  
Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio

1. The following report of an UFO is submitted per para. 14, AFR 200-2 and 200-2A:

a. DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECTS:

(1) The larger of the two objects appeared round. The smaller object was shaped approximately like a fly wing. No empennage could be distinguished on the smaller object.

(2) The larger object compared in size with a pinhead when held at arms length. The smaller object was about half the size of the larger.

(3) The larger object was white when first sighted but changed to flashing white (1 FLASH/SEC) as it passed by the observer. It continued flashing until it passed from view. The smaller object was brownish grey in color.

(4) There were two objects.

(5) The wing-shaped, smaller object was flying on the left side of the larger object when first sighted. It then made an extremely rapid crossover to the right side of the larger object, as viewed by the observer.

(6) Neither object had any discernable features or details.

(7) There was no tail, trail, or exhaust from either object.

(8) There was no sound associated with the sighting.

(9) There were two unusual features:

(a) The very rapid crossover (estimated to be about two sec.) from the left to the right side of the larger object by the smaller object. Both appeared to be traveling at the same speed and there was no apparent lag by the smaller object due to the crossover.



(b) The smaller object disappeared rapidly while the larger object remained the same size flashing or blinking at the rate of about 1 FLASH/SEC. When first sighted the larger object was white, but as it passed from view it gave off a flash at regular intervals.

b. DESCRIPTION OF COURSE OF OBJECTS:

(1) The observer heard a light plane in the area and when he glanced up to locate it the two objects caught his eye.

(2) The elevation and azimuth of both objects were 45 and 175 degrees respectively.

(3) The elevation remained at above 45° throughout the sighting. The smaller object disappeared from view at an azimuth of approximately 090 degrees. The azimuth of the larger object when it disappeared was approximately 45 degrees.

(4) The flight path was straight with the exception of the maneuver of the smaller object described in a(9)(a).

(5) The objects disappeared to the northeast due to time and desert haze. The larger object because of its flashing remained visible for a longer time.

(6) The larger object was visible for three minutes. The smaller object was visible for about one minute.

c. MANNER OF OBSERVATION:

(1) Ground-visual.

(2) None.

(3) N/A.

d. TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTING:

(1) 2345 zulu time 22 Aug 65.

(2) Day.

e. LOCATION OF OBSERVER:

(1) Lancaster, Calif.

f. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION ON OBSERVER:

(1) [REDACTED]

Age 41

[REDACTED]  
Lancaster, Calif.

Service engineer with General Electric



The observer has combined military and private flying time of over 3,000 hours. I would rate him as very reliable.

g. WEATHER AND WINDS--ALOFT CONDITIONS AT TIME AND PLACE OF SIGHTINGS:

(1) Clear

(2)	Wind Direction <u>in Degrees</u>	Wind Velocity <u>in Knots</u>
Surface	250	16
6,000	255.1	9.9
10,000	261.3	13.5
16,000	246.9	16.3
20,000	254.8	27.6
30,000	261.7	30.2
50,000	249.3	30.8
80,000	92.5	13.7

(3) Clear.

(4) 15 miles.

(5) None.

(6) None.

(7)	<u>Altitude</u>	<u>Temp. in Degrees Centigrade</u>
	6,000	18.8
	10,000	11.2
	16,000	-0.4
	20,000	-9.3
	30,000	-33.8
	50,000	-64.7
	80,000	-51.5

h. ANY OTHER UNUSUAL ACTIVITY OR CONDITION:

(1) None.

i. INTERCEPTION OR IDENTIFICATION ACTION TAKEN:

(1) None.

j. Unable to determine any.

k. COMMENTS:



Mr. [REDACTED] stated that, if it had not been for the extremely rapid crossover by the smaller object and the flashing appearance of the larger object, he would not have reported the sighting. His final decision to make the report came only after he heard on an evening telecast that UFOs had recently been sighted in the Los Angeles area. (SSD in Los Angeles had no reports under investigation that could possibly be related to this sighting).

He said that the objects could well have been an escort or chase aircraft in company with a larger aircraft, but that the two unusual factors mentioned above left him with some doubt. As far as I can determine, no one in the area had a flight of this nature, although the possibility that it was two aircraft cannot be ruled out.


Detachment #5, 2d Surveillance Sq (ADC), was queried on the possibility that the sighting may have been a spacecraft, satellite, or some sort of space debris. Their computer check produced negative results, although they cautioned that this didn't automatically rule out the space theory. The input data may well have been outside the tolerance limits of the computer.

I feel that the two above explanations are the most plausible. The observer agrees that either of these may well explain what he saw if there were an aberration of some sort involved. Mr. [REDACTED] did not feel so strongly about the unusual features of the sighting that he would rule out the above explanations.

1. EXISTENCE OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE:

(1) None.

FOR THE COMMANDER

  
JOHN D. BALENT, Capt, USAF  
Technical Evaluation Officer  
Deputy for Foreign Technology